



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/667,000	09/18/2003	Arnold G. Legband		6650
31083	7590	06/21/2005	EXAMINER	
THOMTE, MAZOUR & NIEBERGALL, L.L.C. 2120 S. 72ND STREET, SUITE 1111 OMAHA, NE 68124			HORTON, YVONNE MICHELE	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		3635		

DATE MAILED: 06/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/667,000	LEGBAND, ARNOLD G.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Yvonne M. Horton	3635	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE ____ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) ____ is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) ____ is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.

- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claims 1-9 are objected to because of the following informalities: The applicant is reminded that the claims are directed to the sub-combination of "a bracket" and not the combination of "the bracket, new building structure, the existing building structure, or the frame". If it is the combination that the applicant is seeking patent protection, he must positively cite "the bracket, new building structure, the existing building structure, or the frame" in the claims. Until further clarification, the claims have been examined only as the sub-combination of the bracket. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102


The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.


Claims 1-4 and 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent #5,845,446 to FUNAKI et al. FUNAKI et al. discloses a bracket (4) including a forward/rearward members (42) each having upper (UE) and lower end (43,47) portions that are shaped and sized to "marry" with a profile (as at M), see the marked attachment, of at least one building panel (11). The forward/rearward members (42) of FUNAKI et al. are spaced apart by a top wall (41) and coupled to the forward/rearward members (42) through side wall members (SW), see the marked figure below. The forward/rearward members (42) further define a channel (CH), see also the marked

attachment below; wherein the channel (CH) extends along the length of the bracket (4) and is shaped and sized to "substantially" enclose at least one fastener (6,14,141). In reference to claim 2, the forward/rearward members (42) are in "substantial" parallel



relationship. Regarding claim 3, the forward/rearward members (42) and top wall member (41) are made out of an insulative material – metal or resin. In reference to claim 4, the channel (CH) is shaped and sized to simultaneously and "substantially"

enclose a plurality of fasteners (6,14,141). Regarding claim 6, the forward/rearward members (42) are selected at a height so as to define a spatial distance (SP), see below between the building panels (11) operatively coupled to one another. In reference to claim 7, the spatial distance (SP) between the building panels (11) is



"sufficient" to receive a layer of insulative material (not shown), column 10, lines 47-52. Regarding claim 8, the forward/rearward members (42) are shaped and have height so that a "substantial" portion of the lower end portions (43,47) engage the at least one building panel (11) as at (M), see the marked figure above. In reference to claim 9, the forward/rearward (42) and top (41) members form a "general" U-shaped cross-section.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent #5,845,446 to FUNAKI et al. FUNAKI et al. discloses the basic claimed bracket except for explicitly detailing that the bracket (4) is sized and shaped to prevent parallel movement with respect to the building panel (11). Although FUNAKI et al. does not explicitly detail this, he does; however, in column 5, lines 33-50, indicate that his bracket (4) is "pressed down...producing resilient engagement...wherein no positional adjustment is required"; in column 9, lines 29-37, indicates that his bracket (4) "ensures stable engagement" with the other roofing members; and in column 10, lines 36-40 indicates that his structure "prevent his bracket (4) from moving out of alignment". Hence, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the bracket (4) is prevented from moving, movement that would obviously include both perpendicular and parallel movement.

Claims 10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent #5,845,446 to FUNAKI et al. in view of US Patent #5,511,354 to EIDSON. The structure of FUNAKI et al. discloses steps obvious to securing building panels (11) including the steps of providing at least one bracket (4) comprising forward and

rearward spaced-apart wall members (42), having upper and lower end portions (43,47), coupled to one another by a top wall member (41), and providing said at least one bracket (4) with a channel (CH), see the marked figure above, defined by said forward, rearward (42) and top wall members (41), which extends at least partially along a length of said at least one bracket (4) and is sized and shaped to substantially enclose said at least one fastener (6,14,141), shaping and sizing said lower end portions (43,47) of said forward and rearward wall members (42) with a profile to marry (as at M) a profile of the at least one building panel (11); aligning said at least one bracket (4) so that the profile of said bracket (4) is married (as at M) to the profile of said at least one building panel (11); substantially enclosing said at least one fastener (6,14,141) within said channel (CH), positioning at least one building panel on the top wall member of said at least one bracket (4), securing the at least one building panel (11) to said bracket (4) and the frame member (22) with the at least one fastener (6,14,141). FUNAKI et al. discloses the basic claimed method except for explicitly indication the use of new and existing building panels and fasteners, and except for positioning another panel atop the top wall of the bracket. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that since the bracket and building panels of FUNAKI et al. are merely interconnected through snap-fitting connections and require no conventional bonding, that removal and replacement thereof would be relatively easy and within the general nature, skill and knowledge of one in the art. For instance, the bracket would merely have to be removed by a slight pulling force; wherein a new building panel could be laid and either

the old or a new bracket placed there over. Thus, there is nothing precluding the panels, brackets and fasteners from being either new or existing. Further, EIDSON teaches that it was known in the art at the time the invention was made to position another building (110) panel atop a top wall (44) of a bracket (90) engaging a first building panel (108). Hence it too would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to Provide the structure of FUNAKI et al. with an additional building panel atop a top wall (41) of a bracket of the roofing structure of FUNAKI et al. in order to create a more rigid and structurally sound roofing system while also providing the roofing arrangement with additional means for accommodating more insulation. Regarding claim 11, FUNAKI et al. also obviously discloses the steps of forming said bracket from a substantially insulative material – metal or resin, column 5, lines 7-9; positioning the forward and rearward wall members (42) a substantially parallel relationship with one another; providing said bracket (4) with a select height to define a select spatial distance (SP) between the building panels (11) such that the building panel (11) is positioned on the top wall (41) of said bracket; disposing a layer of insulative material between the building panels (11), column 10, lines 47-52; enclosing a plurality of existing fasteners (6,14,141)within said channel (CH); coupling the bracket (4) the building panels (11) using only the at least one fastener(6,14,141) used to secure building panels (11) to said bracket (4) and the frame member (22); sizing and shaping the channel (CH) to substantially enclose the at least one fastener (6,14,141) such that said bracket (4) is substantially prevented from movement with respect to the at least one building panel (11); wherein said bracket (4) is provided with

a "generally" U-shaped cross-section. Regarding the step of preventing parallel movement of the bracket in claim 17, although FUNAKI et al. does not explicitly detail this, he does; however, in column 5, lines 33-50, indicate that his bracket (4) is "pressed down... producing resilient engagement... wherein no positional adjustment is required"; in column 9, lines 29-37, indicates that his bracket (4) "ensures stable engagement" with the other roofing members; and in column 10, lines 36-40 indicates that his structure "prevent his bracket (4) from moving out of alignment". Hence, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the bracket (4) is prevented from moving, movement that would obviously include both perpendicular and parallel movement.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yvonne M. Horton whose telephone number is (571) 272-6845. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30 am - 3:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carl D. Friedman can be reached on (571) 272-6842. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Yvonne M. Horton
Examiner
Art Unit 3635
6/15/05